



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

II.—CONTRIBUTIONS TO THE STUDY OF HOMERIC METRE.

II. LENGTH BY POSITION.¹

The first chapter of the second part of Solmsen's *Untersuchungen zur Griechischen Laut- und Verslehre*, pp. 129–186, is entitled *Ueber metrische wirkungen und wesen des digamma*, and aims at showing that the digamma can aid in making position only under the following circumstances: (1) In the interior of a word; in other positions only (2) when the lengthened syllable is in the arsis, the lengthening being then due in reality to the force of the ictus; or (3) when the apparently lengthened syllable stands in the first or second thesis, the 'freedom' of using a single short syllable for the thesis being a privilege of the first two feet. This is a revival of the theory of Hartel, *Homerische Studien* III, *Sitzungsberichte der kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften Wien* 1874, lxxviii, pp. 7–87, which Solmsen has extended to include the cases of δF-, Fλ- and Fρ- and for which he has provided a new phonetic interpretation. Solmsen's conclusions have met with the approval among others of Sommer (cf. below) and of Bechtel, *Die Vocalcontraction bei Homer*, p. ix, and have been opposed, so far as I know, only by Danielsson, *Zur Lehre vom homerischen Digamma*, IF. xxv, 264–84, if we disregard Blass' incidental protest *Hermes*, xxxvii, 473. Convincing as I find Danielsson's argumentation, it seems to me that it is possible to strengthen it still further, and that it is desirable to do so both because of the bearing of this theory upon the Homeric question, and because the appearance of Sommer's article, *Zur griechischen Prosodie*, *Glotta*, i, 145–240, has since supposedly given new support to Solmsen's theory.

The statistics compiled by Hartel which serve as the foundation of Solmsen's argument may be exhibited in the following table²:

¹ See A. J. P. XXVIII 401–410.

² That they require correction in the light of our present knowledge of the range of the digamma does not affect the argument, cf. Solmsen, p. 132 n.

The influence of initial F before a vowel :

Is manifested			Is not manifested	
In Arsis.	In Thesis.		In Arsis.	In Thesis.
		a) by preventing		
000	2324	elision of short vowel		324
507	164	shortening of long		
		vowel or diphthong	000	78
359	(46)	b) by 'making position'	000	215

Of the 46 instances of 'position lengthening' in the thesis 42 belong to the pronominal forms (οἱ 41, εὐ 1); while three others (P 142, Ω 419, γ 472) are in the first thesis, leaving only a single example in the second thesis : θ 215 εὖ μὲν τόξον οἶδα εὐξοον ἀμφαφάσθαι.

To these facts Solmsen demands that we shall no longer close our eyes, but endeavor to understand them scientifically. To be compared with them are the facts exhibited by the following table compiled from Solmsen, pp. 133-136, omitting the examples of λίσσομαι on account of the uncertainty of the etymology.

A short vowel before δF-, Fρ-, Fλ- :

Is lengthened		Remains short	
In Arsis.	In Thesis.	In Arsis.	In Thesis.
122	4 ²	00	62 (63)

² Always in the first thesis.

On these facts Solmsen seems to have reasoned as follows, cf. p. 132: Under a) we find about 3000 cases in which the influence of the digamma is manifested, and only about 400 in which it is 'neglected'; we may therefore conclude with the vast majority of scholars that the verses containing these 400 examples were composed at a time when the digamma had vanished from the living usage of the language. Under b) and in the second table the distribution of the examples is totally different. The examples before the pronoun do not belong here, but are to be explained, p. 130: "aus der enklitischen natur des personal pronomens, kraft deren οἱ, εὐ mit dem vorhergehenden worte zu einer einheit verwachsen, fuer die nicht die behandlungsweise des aus- und anlauts, sondern die des wortinlauts massgebend ist"; the examples in the first thesis may be classed as στίχοι λαγαροί; while various explanations can be given for θ 215. For in the first place emendation -τόξον γ' οἶδα- is extremely easy; or, secondly, the irregularity may be debited to the "spæting" who composed this part of the Odyssey; or, finally, cf. Rh. M. 60. 492, it may

be taken as an indication that the second foot also has its special privileges. Setting aside these 50 examples we see that 'position is made' 481 times in the arsis, never in the thesis; while 'position is neglected' never in the arsis, but 277 (278) times in the thesis. Under these circumstances it seems proper to ascribe the lengthening in the arsis to the force of the arsis (ictus), and to regard the syllables remaining short in the thesis as representing the language's natural treatment of a syllable ending in a short vowel before the combinations of consonants in question. The problem thus reduces itself to the question: Why do not -ν F-, -ρ F-, -ς F- have the same effect on the preceding syllable which -ν π-, -ρ τ-, -ς κ-, etc., exert.

The explanation is to be found by giving heed to the doctrines long since established by the science of Phonetics. According to Sievers⁴, § 651 (= ⁵, § 709) the essential thing in a syllable 'long merely by position' is that one or more consonants belonging to the syllable shall follow after its short vocalic element. Consequently if a group of consonants can be drawn to the following syllable, the quantity of the preceding syllable will remain unaffected. Whether this is possible or not will depend upon the relative 'sonority' of the consonants. For, according to Sievers⁴, § 490 ff. (= ⁵, § 527 ff.) there must be a rise of sonority from the beginning of the syllable to its vocalic element. Now the digamma was a semi-vowel *w*, not a spirant *v*; as such it was superior in sonority to *n*, *r*, or *s*, and consequently syllables beginning *nwa*-, *rwa*- or *swa*- are possible. Accordingly the natural pronunciation of κρήγυον *Fēipās* was *krēgυō-nweipās* and similarly for all other cases in the thesis. But in the arsis the force of articulation was more than usual, and hence (p. 166) it is stated: "Wenn es andererseits *Fēipās* *Fēpos* heisst, so ist der schliessende consonant hier in der arsis dank der besonders kraeftigen expiration, mit der diese hervorgebracht wurde, bei der vorhergehenden silbe geblieben," with which is to be compared the fuller explanation given on p. 164: "Trat diese silbe aber in die hebung, d. h. wurde der expirationstrom, mittels dessen sie hervorgebracht wurde, verstaerkt und zugleich verlaengert, so erreichte er sein ende nicht mehr mit dem schliessenden vocale selbst, sondern umfasste auch noch den ersten laut jener verbindungen ganz oder teilweise, die silbe als solche wurde 'positione' lang".

At first sight this theory seems to provide a uniform and

simple solution for a vexatious problem ; on further examination, however, it can in my opinion be shown to be untenable. The phonetic doctrines in the first place, which are put forward with such confidence, cf. p. 161: "Die lautphysiologie hat darueber laengst klarheit geschafft, ihre lehren sind aber bei der beurtheilung metrischer phaenomene bisher nicht immer genuegend beherzigt worden", are in fact seriously questioned by other phoneticians, as may be seen from a comparison of Jespersen, *Lehrbuch der Phonetik*, § 209, and Scripture, *Elements of Experimental Phonetics*, p. 449 ff. The dualism of Sievers' theory which defines the syllable now as the portion of sound uttered with a single puff of breath (so that e. g. *body* may be a single syllable) and again as the portion of sound lying between two sound minima (so that *body must* be two syllables) is justly criticised by Jespersen. For Solmsen's purpose it is, however, indispensable because he must operate both with a division */nwa-* on the principle of sonority and again with a division *n-wa-* on the breath-puff principle, cf. also the double treatment of $\pi\tilde{\alpha}/\tau\rho\acute{o}s$ and $\pi\tau\rho\acute{o}s$. Furthermore Jespersen states that the principle of sonority can determine only the summits of the syllables, and is not of the least help in determining where one syllable ends and the next begins. Indeed, the reality of such divisions, when there is 'close contact', is to be denied, cf. § 205: "Das einzige was hier (i. e. in *feste*) vorliegt, sind zwei Gipfel mit dazwischenliegender Senkung, aber es ist eben so muessig, sich darueber zu streiten, ob diese Senkung ganz zum ersten Gipfel oder ganz zum zweiten oder halb zu beiden gehoert, wie es muessig ist, in einem Tal in der Natur nach einer bestimmten Scheide zwischen zwei Bergen zu suchen". Upon this subject Scripture is equally definite, cf. p. 450: "I do not believe, however, that a division of the flow of speech into separate blocks (termed 'syllables') has the slightest justification or the slightest phonetic meaning". A corollary—the futility of dividing Homeric Greek into syllables, when we are unable to do the same for languages which we speak and hear daily—is drawn by Jespersen, p. 201, ann. 1, in a form more sarcastic than I care to quote in this connection. Not being a phonetician myself, I must leave to others the further discussion of these phonetic doctrines ; but, even on the basis of the Sievers theory, Solmsen's treatment of the digamma becomes involved in insuperable difficulties.

In the first place the lengthening before *oi* is explained, cf. above, as due to its enclitic nature, thanks to which it fuses with the preceding word, so that the consonant group is treated according to the "behandlungsweise des wortinlauts". On the one hand this takes no account of the passages, B 665 (?), E 338, Z 90, 101, 289, II 735, Y 282, Ψ 865, Ω 53, 72, ε 234, ν 430, ο 105, in which *oi* 'fails to make position'. On the other hand, if the theory is to be consistent, it must demand 'position lengthening' in the case of all other words which are "zu einer einheit verwachsen". What words are to be considered thus fused, is a question on which scholars differ in practice; and as I know of no definition by Solmsen himself I shall follow that of Sommer, p. 147, though I believe that he has drawn the lines too narrowly. His fifth class enclitics or postpositive particles may be taken first as offering the closest parallel. Here belong κτῖλος Fώς Γ 196 and the similar passages, Θ 94, 271, N 137, χ 299. Of the article and noun (Class I) we have no examples for the digamma, but under it are to be included (p. 152) examples of adjective and noun, such as μελιηδέος Φοίνου Σ 545, δαΐφρονος Φοινείδαο E 813, ἐὼν Φοίκον ψ 8, περιμήκει Φράβδφ κ 293, εὐανθεί Φλάχνη λ 320. A weakly accented pronominal subject (Class II) occurs in εἴ τις Φίδοιτο Γ 453, cf. Ω 337; a weakly accented pronominal object (Class III) in οἷ μιν Φίδοντο Δ 374, cf. E 845, ψ 91; preposition and noun (Class IV) ἐπὶ Φρυνμφ Ω 271, ἐς Φοῖκον β 52, ξ 318, ρ 84, ἐς Φίλιον E 204, Φ 81, 156, ξ 238, ρ 104, ἐς Φέκαστον I 180, ἐν Φιλίφ Ω 67, ἐν Φεκάστη B 719, πρὸς Φὸν λέχος A 609, πρὸς Φὸν μεγάλητορα θυμόν Δ 403, etc., and presumably Solmsen would read πὰρ Φίλου Δ 166, α 259. Class VI a weakly accented particle which modifies the sentence is too well represented to render full citation profitable, but cf. πρῶτος μὲν Φάναξ H 162, Ψ 288, and B 70, 802, Θ 233, I 374, N 278, etc., etc. To these we should add at least examples of such close syntactic combinations (cf. Ehrlich KZ xl. 393 f.) as, κρήγνον Φείπας A 106, ιερὰ Φρέξας A 147, κακὰ Φρέξαι Γ 354, cf. E 403, Λ 502, 838, Y 186, Φ 214, εἶδος Φιδόντες Γ 224, οὐδὲν ΦεΦοργώς χ 318. And *a fortiori* the cases of compound words like παρΦείπη, ὑπΦείξομαι, after the treatment of which on p. 159, we must presume that Solmsen also understands ἐσΦιδούσα, εἰσανΦιδών, ἐκκατΦιδών. In all of these cases, in which Solmsen's theory demands 'position lengthening' before the digamma¹, our text actually shows a short vowel. Danielsson,

¹ Sommer's remark, p. 150, is incomprehensible to me.

who felt this difficulty in part, is of the opinion (p. 274) that it may perhaps be avoided without too great difficulty. I, however, do not see how this can be done, unless it be conceded that the neglect of the digamma is evidence that these verses too were composed at a time when the digamma had vanished from the living usage of the language. Such an explanation would be correct, but it would be permitting the entrance of the wedge which would disrupt the theory.

A minor inconsistency is that to explain $\pi\alpha/\rho\text{F}\epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\eta$, we must regard w as more sonorous than r ; while on the other hand $\iota\epsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}/\text{F}\rho\acute{\epsilon}\xi\alpha\varsigma$ shows that r exceeds w in sonority. Much more significant is the fact that on the principle of 'sonority syllables' divisions such as $/sma-$, $/sna-$, $/sra-$, $/sla-$ are required, and consequently there should be no 'position lengthening' before $-s\ \mu-$, $-s\ \nu-$, $-s\ \rho-$, $-s\ \lambda-$. Sommer foresaw this objection, but his attempt to obviate it, p. 174, does not seem to me successful. That the difference between s and r is negligible, while that between r and w is not, seems to me a Procrustean adaptation of the theory to the facts. One who scans $\pi\acute{\alpha}/\rho\text{F}\epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\eta$, $\kappa\rho\acute{\eta}\gamma\nu\acute{o}/\nu\text{F}\epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\alpha\varsigma$, should also demand $*\pi\acute{\alpha}\iota\delta\epsilon/\sigma\lambda\acute{\iota}\pi\omicron\nu\tau\omicron$.

Other objections to the theory—that it assumes syllables beginning $nwa-$, $rwa-$ such as cannot be proved for the older periods either of Greek or of other Indo-European languages; that it runs counter to what we know of the effect of $w-$ in making position in Latin and Vedic poetry—may be passed over with a reference to Danielsson, p. 275 ff. The latter scholar has also explained most satisfactorily the points of real significance in Hartel's statistics. The final redaction of our poems (and the composition of parts of them) fell in a period when digamma was no longer spoken in the Ionic dialect. In close combinations of words (Konnexe), however, the resulting hiatus remained; thus $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \text{Foi}$ became $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \text{oi}$ and only later by recomposition $\delta'\ \text{oi}$, and similarly $\upsilon\pi\acute{o}\ \text{*}\text{Ιλιον}$, $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\upsilon$ were spoken for a time after all traces of the initial consonant had been lost in freer combinations of these words. Cf. also Thumb, IF. ix, 327. Besides hiatus in the verse was justified at certain points by the caesurae and diaereses, and the final vowels of words, such as \acute{o} , $\acute{\epsilon}$, $\acute{\tau}\acute{o}$, $\pi\rho\acute{o}$, $\tau\acute{\iota}$, $\tau\acute{\iota}$, $\acute{o}\tau\iota$, $\pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}$, etc., were never or rarely elided. Under these influences the hiatus occasioned in the older text by the subsequent loss of the digamma seemed justified, was perpetuated in the tradition, and imitated in the later compositions. For 'posi-

tion lengthening ' in the arsis, similar favorable conditions existed partly in the lengthening before caesurae, partly in the licenses of the first and sixth arses, and partly in the metrical lengthening of antispast and bacchic words. Most of the cases of lengthening in the thesis before (F)οί occur in cretic *Konnexe*; the order of words being unchangeable (cf. Wackernagel, IF. i, 333 ff.) and the metrical lengthening of such words again supplying a justification.

Apart from these cases the possibility of lengthening in the thesis was at the start narrowly limited. When there was a ' real separation of words ' it was necessarily confined to the first and second theses, for reasons given briefly and correctly by Danielsson, p. 283, anm. 1, and which will be discussed in detail later. After the loss of the digamma such verses might be regarded as *στίχοι λαγαροί* and remain unchanged. Of them we have eight examples which are perhaps to be increased by emendation, cf. p. 265, anm. 4. The only other possibility for lengthening was in monosyllabic words compounded or closely connected with the following words: as examples Danielsson suggests *παρ Φειπέμεν, ὁ δ' ἔλινον ἐξαλάπαξε, σὺ ν' Φοῖσι τέκεσσι*. The absence of such *Konnexe* is a fact for which Solmsen's theory can offer no explanation. Danielsson points out that after the loss of the digamma the verses would seem defective in a way without any parallel in Homeric versification, and that therefore such examples as did exist must necessarily be removed in the process of modernization.

There is, however, another point in Hartel's statistics which requires consideration. In some 400 instances there is total or partial elision of a vowel before words which once began with the digamma. Most investigators—including Solmsen, cf. p. 132—agree that these instances are to be explained as due to the fact that the digamma was no longer pronounced when the verses containing these examples were composed or revised into their present form. This being the case it follows that at that time a short syllable ending in a consonant would remain short before these words simply because in their new pronunciation the second consonant required to make the syllable long ' by position ' is lacking. These 400 examples of elision demand therefore as their counterpart some instances¹ of what we call " neglected

¹ That *all* of them must fall in the thesis is a fact too obvious to mention.

position". A theory which removes all such examples discredits itself by proving too much.

At first sight it might seem that the instances of 'neglected position' are so numerous (277) as compared with the instances of elision (400) as to afford no prospect of explaining the bulk of them in this fashion; especially when we contrast the 2995 cases in which elision is prevented with the 531 cases in which position is made. However the problem is too complicated to be solved by such a simple proportion; other factors are involved. For in the first place it follows from the facts explained by Danielsson that we can have (apparent) neglect of position because the digamma is not pronounced, and at the same time hiatus, whether real or merely imitative. Secondly, making position in the thesis is turning a possible dactyl into a spondee, a thing which the poet will be inclined to avoid.¹ Finally the position lengthening in the thesis can take place in case of a 'real separation of words' only when there is a diaeresis after a spondee, the limitations on which will concern us later. Neglect of position on the other hand occurs either in a trochaic caesura or a dactylic diaeresis, which are the favorite divisions of the Homeric verse. A statistical solution of the problem is impossible, and we must therefore examine the context in which each example occurs to see whether we are justified in assuming that its author actually spoke initial digamma.

As evidence of the absence of the digamma we are warranted in accepting a single passage which shows elision and does not require emendation. Such a principle may be deduced from the practice of Bechtel, and if a theoretic justification of it is desired it can be found in Danielsson's article. Still this leaves the practical question of when emendation is required. On this subject Sommer, p. 149, lays down the principle "so wenig wie moeglich herumzudoktern", and Solmsen is ready with terms like "mit conjecturen heimsuchen", p. 157, for emendations of which he does not approve. Convenient as it would be to follow this practice, I prefer to take a more objective standard. Bechtel has shown that contraction (under certain limitations), iteratives, the use of *ες*, *αυ*, the article, the loss of intervocalic *ι*, and the use of the short forms of the dative plural of the first and second declensions, are phenomena which go hand in hand with the ab-

¹In this connection cf. Witte, *Glotta*, ii. 8-18.

sence of initial digamma. An emendation made simply to restore a digamma is necessary only when the context shows none of these peculiarities, excepting of course such instances as are also to be removed by emendation. Furthermore some of the instances of 'neglected position' are in themselves sufficient proof. In the first place are to be counted as such the examples before the pronoun *οἱ*; and we have seen above that consistency requires the same for compounds, and for word groups, because in these the digamma if present must according to Solmsen produce lengthening as the "behandlungsweise des wortinlauts". In citing the examples I shall therefore print these with an asterisk prefixed but without further comment.

Even when such evidence is not available the absence of the digamma can sometimes be established more indirectly. As an example I shall take the Glaukos episode Z 119-236, which in spite of its length contains no evidence of the loss of the digamma unless it be Z 151 *ἡμετέρην γενεήν** πολλοὶ δέ μιν ἄνδρες ἴσασιν. That we must so regard it and not read *ἄνδρες* *ἴσασι* or reject the line with Bentley follows not merely from the other evidences of late date, cf. Bechtel, p. 18, *γνώσι, ἦν, θάρσει, ἡγορέην, ἴος, ἔσκειν*;¹ but even more from the fact that this episode is shown by its contents to be the latest of the episodes in which the Lycians figure, cf. Robert, p. 402 ff., while these older episodes, cf. below, show the absence of the digamma.

I shall begin by selecting from the Iliad² the strata for which the absence of the digamma can be established with ease, and then see how many examples of 'neglected position' re-

¹ For the substitution of *ἦεν* there is here no need.

² I have not examined the Odyssey because I consider it proved that the oldest parts of the Odyssey are not earlier than late parts of the Iliad. In reading Jacobsohn's interesting, but in its main contention unconvincing, article I note, *Hermes* xliv. 101, that on account of Solmsen, *Unters.*, p. 160, I should have included instances of *δυσφηχέος* where clearly the "behandlungsweise des wortinlauts" must be demanded. The instances of *δύσχηος* are all in late passages (B 686, H 376, 395, A 590, N 535, Π 442, Σ 307, 464, X 180) except A 524, where *πολέμου δυσφηχέος* should be read for *πολέμοιο δυσχηέος*. Witte, *Singular and Plural*, p. 79, anm. 1, adheres to the Hartel-Solmsen theory and operates with *λαὸς Φεῦμμελίω Πριάμοιο*. In Homer—contrast *δορ** *ἐν εἰδίς*—the word is without trace of digamma so that a direct equation with *vasu* is most improbable, cf. Leo Meyer, and Prellwitz, *s. v.* This illustrates a weakness of the theory—the way in which it permits the assumption of a digamma where such a sound does not exist.

main and how they are to be explained. Not having access to Knos' work the examples have been collected by the aid of Hartel, Solmsen and Gehring. That I refer to Bechtel for the linguistic evidence of late date other than elision before digamma, and that I have followed in the main Robert's analysis requires no justification.

A. 438: ἐκ δ' ἐκατόμβην βῆσαν ἐκηβόλω Ἀπόλλωνι

In the patchwork, cf. Hinrichs, *Hermes*, xvii., 59 ff., episode of the restoration of Chryseis A. 430-87, on which cf. Bechtel, p. 90, absence of the digamma is shown by *μεγάλ' ἴαχε* 482. Solmsen, p. 158, objects to the cogency of this example, presumably wishing to read with Schulze, KZ. xxix, 248, *μεγάλα FFάχε*. With Schulze's proposal to emend about twenty passages in this fashion I cannot entirely agree. Fourteen out of eighteen examples from the *Iliad* come from portions of the poem composed after the loss of the digamma; in these I should allow *ῖαχον*, etc., to stand as augmented forms of *ἰάχω*. The evidence of late date is to be strengthened by examining lines 423-7 and 488-96, the clamps by which the episode is held in place, cf. Robert, p. 558, Bechtel, p. 115. Robert's suggestion that this is the work of the mechanical soul which invented the *Μήνιδος ἀπόρρησις* is very probable and would clinch the question.

* A. 555 μὴ σε παρείπη

* 609 *Ζεὺς δὲ πρὸς δν λέχος ἦμε*

The scene on Olympus A. 533-611 furnishes also: γ' εἴσεται, 548; ἔσεται ἦδος, 576; γ' ἐπέεσσι, 582; for other evidence cf. Bechtel, p. 190, 272, and with the last of these AJPh. xxviii, 402. It is noteworthy that the second example is due to an effort to get rid of lengthening before mute and liquid, as the line must once have run *Ζεὺς δὲ πρὸς λέχος ἦ(ε)*.

* B. 70 ὥς ὁ μὲν εἰπὼν

219 ψεδὴν δ' ἐπενήνοθε λάχνη

* 233 οὐ μὲν ἔοικεν

* 269 ἀχρεῖον ἰδὼν

The *Διάπειρα* B 53-381 contains also *νῦν δ' ἴδεν* 82, *τοσσαῦτ' ἔτεα* 328, and frequent cases of contraction, cf. Bechtel, p. 12.

* Γ 196 *αὐτὸς δὲ κτίλος ὤς*

* 224 *οὐ τότε γ' ὦδ' Ὀδυσῆος ἀγασσάμεθ'* εἶδος ἰδόντες

The linguistic stage of the *Τειχοσκοπία*, Γ 121-244 is sufficiently

characterized by the evidence collected by Bechtel, p. 44. Disregard of the digamma is shown by line 224 itself and also in line 173 *θάνατός μοι ἄδειν*, and as this episode is closely interwoven with the *ῥορκοι* we may add *οἴσσετε δ' ἄρνε* in line 103, if the text be correct.

* Γ 354 *Ξεινοδόκον κακὰ ῥέξαι*

The short prayer of Menelaos contains also *κάκ' ἔοργεν* 351; in moral tone it resembles the *ῥορκοι* and the fourth book, rather than the oldest stratum of the third. Originally 356 followed 349.

* Γ 453 *οὐ μὲν γὰρ φιλότῃ γ' ἐκέλευσαν, εἰ τις ἴδοιτο*.

A line remarkable both for its syntax and for the form *ἐκέλευσαν*. It stands in a passage 448–61 which is connective tissue between the *ῥορκοι* and the *ῥορκίων σύγχυσις*, both episodes in which the digamma is lost. Bechtel's verdict, p. 44, is "so konnte nur ein Rhapsode stammeln".

Δ 138 *ἦ οἱ πλείστον ἔρυστο*

On the one side is *ῥθ' ἡδέι* 132 and on the other *ῥδ' ἐρέει* 176; for the language of lines 1–219 cf. Bechtel, p. 44.¹

* Δ 232 *καὶ ῥ' οὓς μὲν σπεύδοντας ἴδοι*
 * 240 *οὓς τινας αὖ μεθιέντας ἴδοι*
 * 286 *σφῶι μὲν οὐ γὰρ ἔουκ' ὀτρυνέμεν*
 287 *ἀνώγετον ἴφι μάχεσθαι*
 * 341 *ἐπέοικε*
 * 374 *οἱ μιν ἴδοντο*

The *Ἀγαμέμνονος ἐπιπώλησις* Δ 220–421 clearly presupposes the earlier part of the book from which cases of elision have just been cited. Moreover all but one of the instances occur in groups of closely united words. The evidence collected by Bechtel, p. 43, Robert, p. 211, includes contraction, iteratives, the short dative, loss of intervocalic ι and Ionic metathesis. There is therefore no reason to doubt that this section was composed after the loss of the digamma; and we must regard its examples of hiatus as merely imitative.

Ε 23 *ἀλλ' Ἥφαιστος ἔρυστο*
 * 538 *ἦ δ' οὐκ ἔγχος ἔρυστο*
 606 *μενεαινέμεν ἴφι μάχεσθαι*
 706 *Αἰτώλιον Οἰνόμαόν τε*

¹ All examples of the digamma claimed by Solmsen will be treated, though it will afterwards be shown that this is not a digamma word.

- * 813 δαίφρονος Οἰνείδαο
- * 845 μή μιν ἰδοι.....
- * 885 ἥ τέ κε δηρόν
- * 895 ἀλλ' οὐ μάν σ' ἔτι δηρόν

These examples all come from portions recognized by Robert, p. 177 ff., as belonging to the original stock of the *Διομήδους ἀριστεία*. This stratum contains also *ἵππους δ' οἷς ἐτάροισι* (165), *οὔτ' ἔπει* (879), and other indications of later date collected by Bechtel, pp. 43, 53.

- * E 204 πεζὸς ἐς Ἴλιον εἰλήλουθα

In an interpolation (192-208) made to establish a connection with the *Ὀρκίων σύγχυσις*, cf. Robert, p. 182, Bechtel, p. 50.

- * E 338 πέπλου, ὃν οἱ Χάριτες κάμον αὐταί
- * 403 αἰσυλα ῥέζων
- * 353 τὴν μὲν ἄρ' Ἴρις

The last example is cited because on Solmsen's theory it could be read ἄρ *Ἴρις*; that it really proves the loss of digamma for this passage is shown by *πὰρ δέ οἱ Ἴρις* (365). The passages are from the Aphrodite episode (311-444), on which cf. Robert, p. 183, Bechtel, p. 156.

- * E 451 ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρ' εἰδῶλω

The short episode of the 'wraith' of Aineias (446-53, 512-18) is obviously still later; for its language cf. Bechtel, p. 195. We must therefore consider this passage as an instance of elision, and not read ἄρ *Ἐιδῶλω*.

- E 470=792 ὡς εἰπὼν ὤτρυνε μένος καὶ θυμὸν ἐκάστου.

The first of these lines has been shown by Robert to be connected with the introduction of the Sarpedon episode to which we are coming; the second is in the episode 711-92 of the visit of Hera and Athene to the battlefield. For the latter passage it is sufficient to refer to Robert, p. 189 f.

- E 683 Σαρπηδὼν Διὸς νῖός, ἔπος δ' ὀλοφύονδ' ἔειπε.

That the combat of Sarpedon the Lycian and Tlepolemos the Heraklid must belong to the latest additions to the *Iliad*, hardly requires discussion, but reference may be made to the linguistic evidence collected by Bechtel, pp. 189, 304. The digamma is

neglected in τ' ἔλδεται (481) in a passage intended to lead up to this episode, cf. Robert, p. 186.¹

- * Z 90 πέπλον δς οἱ δοκέει
- * 101 οὐδέ τις οἱ δύναται μένος ἰσοφαρίζειν.
- * 289 ἐνθ' ἔσαν οἱ πέπλοι παμπούκιλοι, ἔργα γυναικῶν

Further evidence is not required, but cf. Robert, p. 194 f., Bechtel, p. 120.

- Z 386 ἀλλ' ἐπὶ πύργον ἔβη μέγαν Ἰλίου . . .
- 403 οἷος γὰρ ἔρύετο Ἴλιον Ἑκτωρ.

From the Ἑκτορος καὶ Ἀνδρομάχης ὁμιλία (365–502). Even when 367 is emended οὐ γάρ [τ'] Φοῖδα, and μάλιστα δ' ἐμοί is accepted in 493 on the strength of Ox. Pap. 445, there still remains Ἰλίου ἱφι (478) as proof of the loss of the digamma which harmonizes well with the other evidence of later date adduced by Robert, p. 198, and Bechtel, p. 111.

- * H 21 Περιγάμον ἑκατιδῶν
- 108 δεξιτερῆς ἔλε χειρός, ἔπος τ' ἔφατ(ο) . . .
- * 162 ὥρτο πολὺν πρῶτος μὲν ἀναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων
- 277 σκῆπτρα σχέθον, εἶπέ τε μῦθον.

None of the examples come from the battle of Hector and Aias, but all are in the material added to turn this battle into a formal duel, cf. Robert, p. 169 ff. From the same part come also ὄφρ' εἴπω (68), ὄφρα τις ᾧδ' εἴπησιν (300); for other linguistic evidence of later date, cf. Bechtel, p. 16 f.

- H 467 νῆες δ' ἐκ Λήμνοιο παρέστασαν οἶνον ἄγουσαι

For the loss of the digamma cf. γένετ' Ἰλίου (345), ὄφρ' εἴπω (369), καὶ ἔτ' οἴκοθεν (364 = 391), καὶ δὲ τόδ' εἰπόμεναι (375); and for other evidence of the age of H 313–482, cf. Robert, p. 168 f., Bechtel, pp. 126, 165.

- * Θ 94 κακὸς ὥς ἐν ὁμίλῳ
- * 133 βροντήσας δ' ἄρα δεινὸν
- * 143 Διὸς νόον εἰρύσσαιτο
- * 233 ἑκατόν τε διηκοσίῳν τε
- * 271 πάϊς ὥς ὑπὸ μητέρα

The late date of the Κόλος μάχη Θ 1–484 is established both by its contents, cf. Robert, p. 164 ff., and by its language, cf. Bechtel,

¹ Solmsen, p. 250, suggests that this form is the later Ionic continuation of ἐφέλδεται; but this is merely exchanging one evidence of late date for another.

p. 24. The loss of the initial digamma is seen in *μοι ἔωθεν* (408=422).

* I 73 *πόλεσιν γὰρ ἀνάσσεις*

Reported as the reading of Aristarchus for the *πολέεσσι δ' ἀνάσσεις* of our manuscripts. The introduction to the Embassy is not older than the Embassy itself to which we are now coming.

I 123=265 *εἰκόσι, δώδεκα*

142 *τίσω δέ μιν ἴσον Ὀρέστη*

* 180 *δενδίλλων ἐς ἑκαστον*

203 *ἐντυνον ἑκάστω*

* 374 *οὐδὲ μὲν ἔργον*

383 *εἰσί, διηκόσιοι δ' ἂν' ἑκάστας (ἂν Φεκάστας?)*

* 392 *ἐπέοικε*

396 *πτολίεθρα ῥύονται*

* 548 *δέρματι λαχρήντι*

Aristarchus also read in 128=270 *γυναῖκας ἀμύμονας ἔργ' εἰδυίας*. Of elision we have the following examples: *ἔργ' εἰδυίας* (128=270), *πλησάμενος δ' οἶνοιο* (224), *δαιτὸς ἐπηράτου ἔργα* (228), *ἐξαπάφοιτ' ἐπέεσσι* (376), *δεκάκις τε καὶ εἰκοσάκις* (379), *παράρρητοί τ' ἐπέεσσι* (526), *πόλλ' ἔρδεσκε* (540), *τάδ' εἰπέμεν* (688); note also *ἔρεξα* (453), *ἔρεξεν* (647). For other evidence cf. Bechtel, pp. 8, 62, 90 f., 148, 164.

K 134 (=B 219) *ἐπενήνοθε λάχνη*

* 146 *ἐπέοικε*

503 *ὃ τι κύντατον ἔρδοι.*

For the loss of the digamma in the Doloneia cf. *θεὸς δ' ὥς* (33), *ἔργα δ' ἔρεξ(ε)* (51), *ἤλυθ' ἰωή* (139), *διασκοπιᾶσθαι ἔκαστα* (388), *δίειπε* (425), *τὴν νύκτ' Οἰνειίδαο πᾶις* (497); for the other evidence cf. Bechtel, p. 3.

* Λ 502 *μέρμερα ῥέζων*

The episode of the wounding of Machaon (499-520) contains also *αὐτίκα δ' ὦν ὀχέων* (517). It is the introduction to the close of the book (597-848) in which occur :

* Λ 673, 686, 698 *ἐν Ἥλιδι*

838 *τί ῥέζομεν*

Loss of the digamma is seen in *ὁπότ' Ἥλείοισι* (671), *ἥδὲ καὶ ἔργων* (703), *ἀμφίσταντο δὴ ἄστυ* (733), *ταῦτ' εἵποις* (791). Corroborative evidence in Bechtel, pp. 98, 209.

M 367 *ὀτρύνετον ἱφί μάχεσθαι*

464 *τὸν ἔεστο περὶ χροί, δοιᾶ δὲ χερσί*

That the *Τειχομαχία* is a unit has been shown by Robert, p. 149 ff., while for its language reference to Bechtel, pp. 30 f., 161 f. will suffice. The loss of the digamma is shown in *ᾠδ' εἴπη* (317), *τιν' ἴδοιτο* (333), *δέ τοι ἔργον* (412), even if *τε καὶ ᾠ* (162) be explained with Bechtel as containing the continuation of *ἔFω*.

* N 137 ὀλοοῖτροχος ὥς
155 ὥς εἰπὼν ὠτρυνε μένος καὶ θυμὸν ἐκάστων.

That the opening of the thirteenth book as far as line 155, with the exception of some embedded fragments of older poetry, is late, has been shown by Robert, p. 123, and is supported by Bechtel's analysis of the language, cf. pp. 191, 201, 25, 105. Loss of the digamma is seen in *μετεισάμενος* (90), which cannot be explained by apocope.

N 277 f. ἐς λόχον, ἔνθα μάλιστ' ἀρετὴ διαείδεται ἀνδρῶν—
ἐνθ' ὃ τε δειλὸς ἀνὴρ, ὅς τ' ἄλκιμος ἐξεφάνθη.

The second line is rightly pronounced by Leaf a gloss and a terribly flat one on the preceding line; it is sufficiently characterized by *δειλός* as a dissyllable, cf. Bechtel, p. 150, and in the sense of *cowardly*. It is therefore hardly necessary to call attention to the fact that N 210-401 is a later stratum, cf. Robert, p. 110, Bechtel, p. 11.

N 349 Ἀχαικὸν Ἰλιόθι πρό

In the same stratum and furthermore in the generally condemned passage N 345-60, of which Leaf says that there is "no other case of such a lengthy and superfluous recapitulation in Homer".

Ξ 346 Κρόνου πάϊς ἦν παράκοιτιν.

One who would interpret this as *πάϊς Fῆν* must emend *λωτόν θ'* *ἐρσήεντα* (348), and then reckon with *αἶμ' ἐμέων* (O 11) in the sequel. For the language of the *Διὸς ἀπάτη* Ξ 153-362 cf. Bechtel, pp. 78, 204.

* O 209 ὀππότε' ἂν ἰσόμερον

The example itself involves the Ionic particle *ἂν* and refers back to the story of the partition of the world, in which *δέδασται ἕκαστος* (189) occurs. For proof that O 1-404 is in the main late, cf. Robert, p. 135 ff.

O 288 ἔλπετο θυμὸς ἐκάστων

In the same stratum and more particularly in the Thoas episode O 281-305, on which cf. Bechtel, pp. 185, 274. It presup-

poses the restoration of Hector by Apollo, so that I may cite as evidence of the loss of the digamma *φωνήσας' ἔπεα* (145), *ὦκ' ἐπέεσσι* (156).

O 500=514 ὡς εἰπὼν ὤτρυνε μένος καὶ θυμὸν ἑκάστου
505 ἦν πατρίδα γαῖαν ἑκάστος

The section O 484-559 contains also *ἔτι δ' ἔλλετο* (539); for its age cf. Robert, p. 141, Bechtel, p. 31.

Π 210 ὡς εἰπὼν ὤτρυνε μένος καὶ θυμὸν ἑκάστου.

On account of *ἔης* (208) the loss of digamma is inferred by Solmsen, p. 254, anm. 1; cf. also Robert, p. 96, Bechtel, p. 165.

* Π 232 οὐρανὸν εἰσανιδῶν

Included here as occurring in a compound; on the age of the digression Π 218-256 which includes three iteratives, cf. Robert, p. 96.

Π 464 Σαρπηδόνοσ ἦεν ἄνακτος
481 ἐνθ' ἄρα τε φρένες ἔρχαται

* 643 ὥρῃ ἐν εἰαρινῇ.....

On the Sarpedon episode Π 419-683 cf. Robert, p. 100 f., p. 395, Bechtel, pp. 5, 204, which afford sufficient evidence to reject the various emendations, cf. Solmsen, p. 160, which have been suggested to remove cases of elision: *ἄρματ' ἀνάκτων* (507), *οὐδ' οὐ* (522), *σύ πέρ μοι ἄναξ* (523), *θεὸς δ' ὦς* (605).

P 41 ἀλλ' οὐ μὰν ἔτι δημόν

* 70 ἐνθα κε ρεῖα

* 90 ὀχθήσας δ' ἄρα εἶπε πρὸς ὃν μεγαλήτορα θυμόν.

On P 1-131 cf. Robert, p. 78 f., and for its instances of contraction Bechtel, p. 147 f., p. 172, p. 193; the loss of the digamma is evident in *σ θ' αἰλις* (54).

P 327 Αἰνεία πῶς ἂν καὶ ὑπὲρ θεὸν εἰρύσσαισθε

* 354 σάκεσσι γὰρ ἔρχατο πάντη

On the section P 319-365 cf. Robert, p. 82; loss of the digamma in *δ' ἐκατηβόλον* (333).

P 635=713 ὅπως τὸν νεκρὸν ἐρύσσομεν

645 ἀλλὰ σὺ ῥῦσαι

On the close of the battle over Patroklos (P 543-761), cf. Robert, p. 85, and Bechtel, p. 50; loss of the digamma is clear from *ἐπιβρέμει ᾗς* (739).

* Σ 258 τόφρα δὲ ῥήτεροι

274 σθένος ἔξομεν, ἄστν δὲ πύργοι

* 367 κακὰ ῥάψαι

The section Σ 239-368 is preparatory for the 'Οπλοποιία, cf. Robert, p. 92. Its first part, the bivouac of the Trojans (243-314) contains two of our examples and also ἀφίξεται ἱλίον (270), τ' ἔλσαι (294), cf. also Bechtel, p. 31. The last example is from the conversation of Zeus and Hera (356-368), for which reference to Leaf will suffice.

* Σ 415 καὶ στήθεα λαχνήεντα

In the 'Οπλοποιία proper; for the language of this section cf. Bechtel, p. 119, and note θ' ἔλικας (401).

* Σ 545 δέπας μελιηδέος οἶνου

In the description of Achilles' shield (481-608). The section contains also δ' ἰέσθην (501), ἔζον' εἰλυμένοι (522). Bechtel's decision (p. 114) to leave this unchanged is far better than Solmsen's (p. 237) "ohne weiteres ἔζον".

Τ 4 εὔρε δὲ Πατρόκλῳ περικείμενον δν φίλον υἱόν

The bringing of the arms to Achilles (Τ 3-39) cannot be older than the 'Οπλοποιία.

* Τ 75 μῆνιν ἀπειπόντος
 124 οὐ οἱ ἀεικέες ἀναστέμεν
 244 ἐείκοσι, δώδεκα (= I 123)
 332 καὶ οἱ δεΐξειας ἑκαστα

The Μῆνιδος ἀπόρρησις cannot be older than the Πρεσβεία; it contains ὄφρ' εἴπω (102) besides ἔπειτ' ἰκέλη (282), εἶδον (292), κῆδ' ἐκάστη (302) in the lament of Briseis (282-303). Even if the latter portion be set aside, the evidence for late date is sufficient, cf. Bechtel, p. 9 f.

* Υ 67 Ποσειδάωνος ἀνακτος
 186 χαλεπῶς δέ σ' ἐολπα τὸ ρέξειν
 * 195 ἀλλ' οὐ νῦν ΣΕΡΥΕΣΘΑΙ
 214 πολλοὶ δέ μιν ἄνδρες ἴσασιν (= Z 151)
 * 282 καὶ δ' ἄχος οἱ χύτο
 * 311 ἥ κέν μιν ἐρύσσει
 * 343 ὀχθήσας δ' ἄρα εἶπε πρὸς δν μεγαλήτορα θυμόν.

The examples are from the council of the gods and the Aineias episode, on which cf. Robert, p. 233, p. 224 ff. Elision is seen in 186 (quoted above) and in δ' εἰσάμενος (224); for other evidence of the date of the language cf. Bechtel, pp. 162, 48.

Υ 371 f. καὶ εἰ πυρὶ χεῖρας ἔοικεν
 εἰ πυρὶ χεῖρας ἔοικε

* 450 νῦν αὐτὲ ΣΕΡΥΣΑΤΟ

On the close of γ cf. Bechtel, p. 192; the only case of elision is the easily emended $\mu' \epsilon\pi\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$ (431), but it must be remembered that parts of the next two books must also be included in forming our estimate.

- * Φ 53 $\delta\chi\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\varsigma \delta' \dot{\alpha}\rho\alpha \epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon \pi\rho\delta\varsigma \delta\upsilon\upsilon \mu\epsilon\gamma\alpha\lambda\eta\tau\omicron\rho\alpha \theta\upsilon\mu\acute{\omicron}\nu$
- * 81 $\delta\tau' \epsilon\varsigma \text{'}\text{Ι}\lambda\iota\omicron\nu \epsilon\iota\lambda\eta\lambda\omicron\upsilon\theta\alpha$
- * 128 $\epsilon\iota\varsigma \delta' \kappa\epsilon\nu \acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\upsilon \kappa\iota\chi\eta\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu \text{'}\text{Ι}\lambda\iota\omicron\nu \iota\rho\eta\varsigma$

From the Lykaon episode Φ 1-16, 34-138, on which cf. Bechtel, p. 206; neglect of the digamma is seen in $\mu\epsilon\gamma\acute{\alpha}\lambda' \text{'}\iota\alpha\chi\omicron\nu$ (10).

- * Φ 156 .. $\delta\tau' \epsilon\varsigma \text{'}\text{Ι}\lambda\iota\omicron\nu \epsilon\iota\lambda\eta\lambda\omicron\upsilon\theta\alpha$
- 194 $\text{'}\text{Α}\chi\epsilon\lambda\acute{\omega}\iota\omicron\varsigma \iota\sigma\omicron\phi\alpha\rho\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\iota$
- * 214 $\alpha\acute{\iota}\sigma\upsilon\lambda\alpha \beta\acute{\epsilon}\zeta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$
- * 217 $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\rho\mu\epsilon\rho\alpha \beta\acute{\epsilon}\zeta\epsilon$

From the Asteropaios episode Φ 139-227, which is clearly younger than the $\text{'}\text{Ο}\pi\lambda\omicron\sigma\omicron\upsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha$, cf. Robert, p. 230 f., and gives other slight evidence of its date in $\beta\alpha\theta\acute{\epsilon}\eta\varsigma$ (213), $\pi\alpha\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ (216), cf. Bechtel, p. 225.

- Φ 236=344 $\omicron\acute{\iota} \rho\alpha \kappa\alpha\tau' \alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu \acute{\alpha}\lambda\iota\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\sigma\alpha\nu$
- * 379 $\omicron\acute{\nu} \gamma\grave{\alpha}\rho \acute{\epsilon}\omicron\iota\kappa\epsilon\nu$
- 391 $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\theta' \omicron\acute{\iota} \gamma' \omicron\acute{\upsilon}\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\tau\iota \delta\eta\rho\acute{\omicron}\nu$
- 411 $\delta\tau\iota \mu\omicron\iota \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma \iota\sigma\omicron\phi\alpha\rho\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ ¹
- * 509 $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma \nu\acute{\upsilon} \sigma\epsilon \text{ΤΟΙΑΔΕΡΕΞΕ}$

The examples are from the Battle with the Skamander and the Θεομαχία , Φ 228-514; for the analysis of which, cf. Robert, p. 231 ff., and for its language, Bechtel, pp. 56, 32. Loss of digamma is clearly shown by $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\epsilon\tau\omicron \delta' \text{'}\iota\varsigma$ (356), after which it is unnecessary to emend $\pi\tau\epsilon\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\iota \tau\epsilon \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota} \text{'}\iota\tau\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\iota$ (350), $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\sigma\tau\acute{\omega}\sigma\alpha\nu\tau' \acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\sigma\sigma\iota$ (286), and even the variant $\delta\acute{\upsilon}\nu\alpha\tau' \iota\sigma\omicron\phi\alpha\rho\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\upsilon$ (357) has some claim to consideration.

- * Φ 552 $\delta\chi\theta\eta\sigma\alpha\varsigma \delta' \dot{\alpha}\rho\alpha \epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon \pi\rho\delta\varsigma \delta\upsilon\upsilon \mu\epsilon\gamma\alpha\lambda\eta\tau\omicron\rho\alpha \theta\upsilon\mu\acute{\omicron}\nu$. = X 98
- 588 $\text{'}\text{Ι}\lambda\iota\omicron\nu \epsilon\iota\rho\nu\acute{\omicron}\mu\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha$
- * X 23 $\delta\varsigma \rho\acute{\alpha} \tau\epsilon \rho\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha \theta\acute{\epsilon}\rho\sigma\iota$
- * 61 $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\delta\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\alpha$
- * 71 $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\iota\kappa\epsilon\nu$
- 259 $\acute{\omega}\varsigma \delta\acute{\epsilon} \sigma\acute{\upsilon} \beta\acute{\epsilon}\zeta\epsilon\iota\nu$

The $\text{'}\text{Εκτορος ἀναίρεσις}$, Φ 515-X 394, contains two certain instances of the loss of digamma $\mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda' \acute{\epsilon}\omicron\lambda\pi\alpha\varsigma$ (Φ 583), $\chi\acute{\epsilon}\omicron\nu\sigma' \acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\alpha$ (X 81); its language is sufficiently characterized by the evidence collected by Bechtel, pp. 9, 162.

- * X 407 $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\iota\delta\acute{\omicron}\upsilon\sigma\alpha$
- 450 $\delta\acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\tau\epsilon, \delta\acute{\upsilon}\omega \mu\omicron\iota \acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\sigma\theta\omicron\nu \text{'}\iota\delta\omega\mu' \delta\tau\omega\upsilon' \acute{\epsilon}\rho\gamma\alpha \tau\acute{\epsilon}\tau\upsilon\kappa\tau\alpha\iota$

¹ Var. lect. $\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\iota\phi\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ which in 488 is the better attested reading.

No one can think of claiming a greater age for the close of the book, and so it is unnecessary to emend the close of 450, while Bechtel's (p. 90) conjecture ἐμεί' ἔπος (454) wins greater probability, cf. also Bechtel, p. 270.

Ψ	49	ὄτρυνον, ἀναξ
	55	ἐφοπλίσσαντες ἕκαστοι	
*	238	πρῶτος μὲν ἀναξ (cf. H 162)
	320	ἐπὶ πολλὸν ἐλίσσεται
	370	θυμὸς ἐκάστον	
	393	ἐπὶ γαῖαν ἐλύσθη	
*	434	αὐτὸς γὰρ ἑκὼν
*	494	τοιαῦτά γε ῥέζοι	
*	585	μὴ μὲν ἑκὼν
	741	τετυγμένον· ἔξ
	748	ἀέθλιον οὐ ἐτάροιο	
*	865	μέγῃρε γάρ οἱ

A closer analysis of the parts of this book is unnecessary for our purpose. The digamma is lost in δεῦρ' ἐρύσας (21), κάλ' ἐικνῖα (66), τίπτε μοι ἡθείη (94), καί μοι ἕκαστα (107), ἔργ' εἰδυῖαν (263), τέρμαθ' ἐλίσσόμεν (309), πάντεσσ' ἔργοισι (671), δ' ἴσα (736), ὅμμ' ἐρέω (787). The language is analyzed by Bechtel, pp. 117, 18, 129, 55, 293, 299, 175.¹

Ω	1	θοᾶς ἐπὶ νῆας ἕκαστοι	
*	53	νεμεσσηθῶμέν οἱ ἡμεῖς	
*	67	οἱ ἐν Ἰλίου εἰσίν	
*	72	ἧ γάρ οἱ αἰεὶ	
*	271	ἐνξέστω ἐπὶ ῥυμῶ	
*	307	εἰσανιδῶν
*	337	ὥς μήτ' ἄρ τις ἰδῇ	
	449	ποίησαν ἀνακτι	
	452	ποίησαν ἀνακτι	
	462	πάλιν εἰσομαι
	510	προπάρωθε ποδῶν Ἀχιλλῆος ἐλυσθείς	
*	595	ἐπέοικεν	

The loss of the digamma is seen in τρις δ' ἐρύσας (16), τρις δ' ἐκάτερθεν (273), ἦλθ' Ἑκάβη (283), ἐπὶ τ' ἔλπεται (491), αἶθ' Ἑκάβη (747). Other evidence in abundance may be found in Bechtel, p. ix., p. 42 f.

In the Iliad there are something over two hundred instances which may be claimed to show 'neglect of position' before digamma. Of these we have now found over 160 in parts of the

¹ The gladiatorial combat 798-825 is of interest as showing how successful imitation could be for a short time. It contains no contracted forms, nor any offences against the digamma.

poem for which we must assume composition at a time when initial digamma was no longer pronounced. Over half of these examples furthermore refute themselves, for in them, had the digamma been pronounced, we must have found lengthening as the "behandlungsweise des wortinlauts". In view of these facts we may proceed with the examination of the remaining passages in the conviction that there is a presumption of late date against a passage which shows 'neglect of position' before digamma.

Π 275 ὡς εἰπὼν ὤτρυνε μένος καὶ θυμὸν ἐκάστον.

At the close of Patroklos' speech (269-274), a cento in which only the words ὡς ἂν Πηλεΐδην τιμήσομεν are original. That we have no early poetry here is obvious, cf. Robert, p. 97.

O 667 the same formula.

The following lines were questioned in antiquity and Leaf says 'the only doubt is whether the athetesis should not extend to Nestor's speech as well'. Linguistically it is characterized by a plural *k*-perfect, found otherwise only in the Embassy.¹ The formula may be left unemended in such surroundings. Compare also Robert, p. 143.

O 639 Κοπρῆος φίλον υἱόν, ὃς Εὐρυπύλοιο ἀνακτοῖς

To the variant ἀέθλων, preferred by Leaf to save the digamma, I attach no importance. Robert, p. 144, has shown that the account of Periphetes' parentage 639-644 is an interpolation. The Heracles myth and the iterative οἴχυνσκε (640) harmonize with the loss of the digamma.

* O 626 ἀνέμοιο δὲ δεινὸς ἀήτη

In the simile 624-629, of which we have here three in succession. We must follow Robert, p. 145, in regarding this line as evidence of the date of the simile.

O 453 κείν' ὄχρεα κροτέοντες. ἀναξ δ' ἐνόησε τάχιστα

The account of the slaying of Kleitos, O 444-457, caused difficulty to the Alexandrian critics. We may note in the first place that he is the charioteer of Polydamas, the Ionic counterpart of Helenos (cf. Robert, p. 388 f.), and secondly that there could be no driving of chariots in the crowded battle about the ships. Robert's conclusion (p. 141) that the lines have supplanted some other exploit of Teucer's seems to me necessary. The only other

¹ Such evidence is valid in spite of Scott's article, *Classical Philology*, VI. 159 ff.

linguistic evidence against the lines is dissyllabic βέλεα (444), which has been emended to βέλος. Bechtel—who accepts Solmsen's theory—endorses the emendation, p. 47, but after seeing the company in which 'neglected position' elsewhere appears the plural should be allowed to stand.

* Ξ 437 ἐζόμενος δ' ἐπὶ γούνα κελαινεφῆς αἶμ' ἀπέμεσσεν
472 ἄξιος; οὐ μὲν μοι κακὸς εἴδεται οὐδὲ κακῶν ἐξ

The first line would itself condemn this section were it not for the ease with which it can be emended. Robert has shown, however, p. 134, that with line 425 there is a sudden shift from Mycenaean to Ionic weapons, and with the latter appear heroes who figure prominently only in the younger strata of the poem. The language of ll. 440–507 has been analyzed by Bechtel, p. 275, with the result that οἶω (454) is the only certain indication of later date, but that this is sufficient. With his view of the age of the passage we must agree and accept the two cases of 'neglected position' as corroborative evidence.

N 191 ἀλλ' οὐ πη χροὸς εἶσατο
204 ἦκε δέ μιν σφαιρηδὸν ἐλιζάμενος δι' ὀμίλου

The first line is included merely for the sake of completeness, as Zenodotos' reading χρώς is clearly to be preferred. In N 182–205 the weapons are Ionic, and we must follow Robert, p. 110, in regarding the 'neglected position' as evidence of late date.

N 163 σχέθ' ἀπὸ ἔο δεῖσε δὲ θυμῷ

Robert, p. 109, has shown that N 162b–164a is an interpolation, describing an Ionic parry made with a Mycenaean shield after the opponent's spear had already broken.

* Λ 166 οἱ δὲ παρ' Ἴλουν σῆμα

If we read παρ Ἴλουν σῆμα we must demand lengthening as the "behandlungswiese des wortinlauts", we are therefore forced to recognize the absence of the digamma, and to regard 166–9 as an "ionische Erweiterung" with Robert, p. 158.

Θ 512 ἐπιβαῖεν ἔκρηλοι
535 αὖριον ἦν

Robert, p. 132, has shown how much Hector's speech gains by the excision of 512–516, and by stopping with 527. Its close is

pretty generally condemned, and an additional reason in the faulty use of *αὔριον* may be found in AJPh. xxiii., p. 434.¹

- * Δ 508 Περιγάμου ἐκκατιδών
 * 516 ὅθι μεθιέντας ἰδοίτο.

The examples prove of themselves the absence of the digamma. They stand in a short passage 507-516 in which Apollo and Athene interfere with the battle causelessly and ineffectively. Robert, p. 176 f., regards the interpolation as extending back as far as 473, but in my opinion on insufficient grounds. There are three grounds of suspicion: *αἰολοθώρηξ* (489) which may, however, be merely a substitution for *αἰολομίτρης*; the neglect of the digamma in *ἐτέρωσ' ἐρύοντα* (492), for which we may read *ἐτέρωσε Φερόντα* with Schulze, Q. E., p. 317; and the appearance of iron in the close of the simile 485-7, which offers other difficulties (cf. Leaf) and may well be dispensed with. On the other hand the helmet of Demokoon is presumably if not conclusively Mycenaean, and the Greek warriors distinguish themselves in the order to be expected in the first Iliad. First blood is given to Antilochus as the youngest member of the expedition, then Aias and Odysseus slay their men. Upon line 506 can follow immediately line 517 so that we gain a larger connected portion of the first Iliad, in which a later poet has thrust an account of supernatural interference more in accord with the fifth book than with the close of the fourth.²

- * B 802 ὧδε δὲ ῥέξαι

A word group which itself proves the loss of the digamma. The close of the Iris-Polites' speech, B 802-6, is intended to pave the way for the Catalogue of the Trojans. Reference to Robert, p. 221, Bechtel, p. 174, will suffice.

- B 518 νῆες Ἰφίτοο
 626 νήσων αἱ ναίουσαι πέρην ἀλός, Ἥλιδος ἄντα
 * 665 ἀπείλησαν γάρ οἱ ἄλλοι
 * 719 ἐν ἐκάστῃ

¹ My tendency to follow Croiset in the interpretation of Σ 269 was a mistake. The *Ἐκτορος ἀνείρεσις* begins four lines later than Robert indicates, p. 503, and the speech of Polydamas is made before sunset.

² In the arrangement of the following fragments I should also differ from Robert, for closely after this portion I would place the Aineias-Menelaos-Antilochos episode. Then when Aineias retreats he calls for Hector, and the first meeting of the latter with Aias occurs.

720 τόξων ἐν εἰδότες ἱφι μάχεσθαι
 743 ὅτε φῆρας ἐτίσατο λαχνέοντας
 750 οἱ περὶ Δωδώνην δυσχείμερον οἰκί ἔθεντο,
 751 οἱ τ' ἅμφ' ἱμερτὸν Τιταρήσιον ἐργ' ἐνέμεντο.

Both Robert, p. 220, and Bechtel, pp. 164, 170, 233, summarily reject the Catalogue of the Ships; on the other hand Solmsen, Rh. M. liii. 146 f., maintains that it is old. That the view of the latter scholar is correct, at least as far as the kernel of the Catalogue is concerned, should in my opinion be conceded. Granting this, however, it is obvious that the Catalogue has been expanded, as it provides for heroes who figure only in the latest parts of the poem. Presumably the examples of 'neglected position' belong to these later additions, and there is something to be said in support of this presumption. Line 626 is a gloss with faulty geography on 'Εχινάων θ' ἱεράων (625). Line 665 might also be accented γὰρ οἱ ἄλλοι; in either case the language would be late, but that is only to be expected in a section dealing with Tlepolemos. The word group in line 719 carries its own conviction, and with it line 720 must fall. Line 743 deals with the Lapithae myth. Lines 750-1 are in the section on the troops of Gouneus, who does not reappear in the Iliad, but was known in the Nostoi, cf. Robert, p. 573. Finally line 518 is the filling out of the family tree of Schedios; emendation is easy, but unnecessary.¹

B 435 μηκέτι νῦν δὴ ταῦτα λεγώμεθα, μηδ' ἐτι δηρόν

The army's meal and the sacrifice offered by the kings, B 399-440, delay the action of the poem, and must be considered, with Robert, p. 220, as an interpolation. Linguistic evidence is ἄλλος

¹ The other evidences of late date are also confined to parts of the Catalogue which may be regarded as additions. Short datives are confined to τοῖς δέ (516, 524, 733, 747) in the summary statements of the numbers of the ships; the systematic carrying out of this is probably late, and a formula beginning τῶ δέ has been pluralized; here also occurs ὀγδῶκοντα (568, 652). Contraction is found Μηκιστέως, ἡγεῖτο in the lines dealing with Euryalos (565-568) and with Machaon ἡγείσθην (731); elsewhere only καλεῖντο (684) in a line which could well be spared, and in ἡγεῖτο (638) where a line like 645 has been altered to introduce 'Ανδραίμονος νῆος. σφέας (704) is a doubtful form, but if the assembling of the fleet at Aulis was originally described in the Catalogue lines 700-4 are a later addition. The iteratives occur only 539, 758 and 770; on the last cf. Schulze, Q. E., p. 349, while ἄν is found only in the story of Thamyris (597).

δ' ἄλλφ ἔρεξε (400), where emendation is unnecessary, the iterative in 404, λεγώμεθα=*converse*, and ἑφαιστος = *fire* (426.)

A 203 ἡ ἵνα ὑβριν ἰδῆς

For the difficulties connected with this short speech, cf. Leaf, Robert, p. 214, Bechtel, p. vii. The only doubt is whether the athetesis should begin with line 201 or line 203.

The outcome of our examination so far has been that about 190 of the alleged cases of 'neglected position' stand in portions of the poem for which we are justified in assuming composition at a time when the digamma was no longer actually spoken. When these are set aside there remain but seventeen examples to which such an explanation cannot apply:

- A 21 ἀζόμενοι Διὸς υἱὸν ἐκηβόλον Ἀπόλλωνα
 * 106 οὐ πώ ποτέ μοι τὸ κρήγνον εἶπας
 * 126 λαοὺς δ' οὐκ ἐπέοικε
 * 147 ἱερὰ ῥέξας
 * 216 ἔπος εἰρύσασθαι
 230 ὃς τις σέθεν ἄντιον εἶπη
 * 294 εἰ δὲ σοὶ πᾶν ἔργον ὑπείξομαι
 * B 471 ὦρη ἐν εἰαρινῇ
 Z 72=Λ 291 ὥς εἰπὼν ὦτρυνε μένος καὶ θυμὸν ἐκάστον
 * Λ 363 νῦν αὐτέ ΣΕΡΥΣΑΤΟ Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων
 * Λ 403=Σ 5 ὀχθήσας δ' ἄρα εἶπε πρὸς δν μεγαλήτορα θυμόν
 * N 555 Νέστορος υἱὸν ἔρυντο
 * Π 735 μάρμαρον ὀκρίοντα, τὸν οἱ περὶ χεῖρ ἐκάλυνφεν
 * P 518 ἡ δ' οὐκ ἐγχος ἔρυντο
 Υ 422 δηρὸν ἐκὰς στρωφᾶσθαι

It might fairly be questioned whether these examples as they stand do not constitute too slender a basis for the erection of Solmsen's theory. However twelve of the examples are word groups demanding lengthening as the "behandlungsweise des wortinlauts". For them another explanation is imperative and they must carry the remaining five examples with them.

In the first place four of the examples are of ἔρυνται *protect*, and in view of their age I consider it necessary to abandon definitely the attempt to connect this verb with Sanskrit *varūtār*, and look upon its relationship to Latin *servare* as definitely established; for the opposite view and the literature of the question, cf. Solmsen, p. 245 ff.¹

¹ Similarly on account of the age of Π 46 ὥς φάτο λισσόμενος, 47 καὶ κῆρα λιτέσθαι we must deny an initial digamma to λίσσομαι.

For the other passages acceptable emendations have long since been proposed, which it is needless to repeat here.¹ I will call attention to the fact that they furnish instances of lengthening in word groups in the third thesis *πρὸς Ἰὸν μεγαλήτορα θυμόν; ὅν Φοι περὶ χεῖρ ἐκάλυσεν*. For the absence of such cases Solmsen's theory had no explanation to offer, while Danielsson had been lead theoretically to the assumption that they had been removed in the course of the modernization of the poems. It is also noteworthy that other examples B 471, Z 72, A 403 had been used by poets who did not pronounce the digamma. The Iliad therefore must have once contained two versions of these lines, and the assimilation of the older to the later form is only what was to be expected. These include the two cases in which it is necessary to depart farthest from the traditional text; elsewhere we have merely the substitution of forms which stop a hiatus for readings which seemed to leave an objectionable one. Corruption to this extent seems to me most probable in view of the vicissitudes the text is known to have undergone.

GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING.

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA.

¹ An exception might be made for A 106 which contains a suspicious use of the article. The line may be a later addition, Agamemnon beginning his speech with the abruptness which is in evidence in the later speeches of the council.

[*To be continued.*]